

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-26. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16-27 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112¶1:

Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16-27 were rejected under § 112¶1. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16-27 are amended herein.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: The AT&T Internet Difference Engine: Tracking and Viewing Changes on the Web (Douglis), U.S. Patent No. 5,978,828 (Greer), U.S. Patent No. 6,259,442 (Britt) and U.S. Patent No. 5,978,807 (Mano).

Douglis is directed to notifying a change of a homepage to a user by e-mail. As stated on page 3 at section 2.1 entitled "Client or Sever Tracking", Douglis discusses two processing methods, namely, one using client-based tools and another using server-based tools. The client-based tools run on a user's machine, typically on the user's list of bookmarks, either periodically or on demand (see, section 2.1 of Douglis). This means that the change in the homepage is tracked on the client system (user's machine), and the client-based tools are thus unrelated to the subject matter of the present invention.

The server-based tools of Douglis track pages that have previously been specified by users by submitting a form with the users' e-mail address and one or more URLs to track (see, section 2.1 of Douglis). This means that the sever system (server) of Douglis tracks the page that has previously been specified by the user. Specifically, the tracking is in response to the specification in advance from the user regarding the page when the user submits a form which indicates the user's e-mail address and the URL which is to be tracked.

In contrast to Douglis, the present invention does not require a user to specify in advance a particular homepage that is to be tracked. Instead, the present invention automatically stores in the server system an access log with respect to a homepage arbitrarily accessed by the client

system, thereby enabling the server system of the present invention to automatically notify the change in the homepage to the user.

Greer is limited to a system according to which a client system specifies a particular URL and the existence of a change in this URL is inquired to the server system. For example, a user of the Greer system configures values in a setup window for causing a download of an update in a web page content (see, col. 7, lines 20-22), causing the page to be downloaded when the user set values are met (see, col. 3, lines 14-57 and col. 7, lines 23-33).

Britt is directed to a system for downloading a software from a server system to a client system. Britt is directed to remotely downloading software upgrades to a client over a satellite link when a user accepts the upgrade. In Britt, a set-top box or computer with program instructions causes download of a new version or an upgrade of software already stored at the set-top box (see, col. 3, lines 47-55). That is, Britt downloads scheduled software upgrades of programs associated with the set-top box of a user.

The Examiner relies on Mano as teaching “a predetermined condition formed by a lapse of a predetermined time”, however, similar to Greer, a user of the Mano system is required to manually specify conditions for downloading a web page (see, column 2, lines 38-44).

Independent claim 1, by way of example, recites, “automatically storing in the server system, an access log with respect to a homepage arbitrarily accessed by the client system”, “automatically creating in the server system, with respect to the client system, a notification...” and “automatically transmitting the notification” based on a predetermined condition is “set by the server system independent of the client system.”

Independent claims 6, 11 and 16-25 also recite access inducing method and apparatus including, “automatically storing in the server system, an access log with respect to a homepage arbitrarily accessed by the client system” (Claims 17-20 “access log with respect to data arbitrarily accessed by the client system”).

Independent claims 26 recites, “automatically storing an access log with respect to a homepage arbitrarily accessed by the client system”, “allowing the homepage provider to create a notification” and “automatically transmitting the notification to the client system” when a condition “set without requiring direct involvement of the client system” is met.

Independent claim 27 recites, “automatically storing an access log with respect to a homepage arbitrarily accessed by the client system”, “allowing the homepage provider to create

a notification, upon a first access to the homepage via the client system" and "transmitting the notification... and **executing the second access** to the homepage using the client system responsive to the transmitted notification" (emphasis added).

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed features of the independent claims including "automatically storing an access log with respect to a homepage [or data] arbitrarily accessed by the client system", as recited in each of the independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16-27.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, claim 5 recites that "the user information includes notifying destination information" and "the notification is made by a communication method depending on the notifying destination information" (see also, claims 10 and 15). The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of claims 5, 10 and 15.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 07/06/2006

By: 
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501